

## REMARKS

With this Response, claim 1 is amended. Claim 4 is canceled. No claims are added. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 5-13 are pending.

## REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

### Claims 1-13

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by ExtremeWare Software User Guide (Software Version 6.1), Published April 2000 (hereinafter “ExtremeWare”).

As claim 4 is cancelled, the rejection is moot with respect to that claim. Of the remaining claims, claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by ExtremeWare.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the following limitation from canceled claim 4: **sending an SRP message** from the master VLAN to the virtual router **on behalf of the membership** of the VLAN domain. The Examiner has rejected this limitation in claim 4 as anticipated by ExtremeWare. Specifically, the Examiner cites the reference at pages 11-11 and 11-13 as teaching this limitation. The cited portion of the reference discusses aggregation of VLANs such that they may use the same default router address and subnet mask. The only mention of standby routing protocol (SRP) which the Applicants see at the cited portion of the reference is a parenthetical regarding the use of member ports on a super-VLAN when SRP is enabled. Applicants see no other mention of SRP, let alone any mention of SRP messaging by a VLAN **on behalf of its membership**, at the cited portion of the reference. Indeed, Applicants see no mention of sending an SRP message from a master VLAN to a virtual router on behalf of the membership of a VLAN domain, as recited in claim 1, in ExtremeWare.

As such, the reference fails to anticipate at least one of the limitations of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over ExtremeWare.

Each of the dependent claims 2-3 and 4-10 depend on independent claim 1 and include all the limitations of that claim. As such, these dependent claims are each patentable over ExtremeWare for at least the same reasons outline above.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-13 as corresponding to claims 1-10, while acknowledging, at page 4 of the Office Action, that claims 11-13 add the element of an end-host. As a first matter, Applicants do not concede that the added element of an end-host is the only difference between claims 11-13 and claims 1-10 or that these claim sets correspond to one another. However, even assuming, for the sake of argument, that such is the case, the Examiner has failed to show, or even claim, that the reference discloses or suggests this added element. For at least this reason, the rejection of these claims is defective, and Applicants respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 5-13 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: July 16, 2008

/Jared S. Engstrom/  
Jared S. Engstrom  
Reg. No. 58,330  
Attorney for Applicant

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

Date: July 16, 2008

/Julie Dussault/  
Julie Dussault